



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/817,324	03/26/2001	Barry Lynn Royer	2001P04786US	8852
7590 11/18/2004			EXAMINER	
Siemens Corporation Intellectual Property Department 186 Wood Avenue South Iselin, NJ 08830			DAVIS, ZACHARY A	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2137	
DATE MAILED: 11/18/2004				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/817,324

Applicant(s)

ROYER ET AL.

Examiner

Zachary A Davis

Art Unit

2137

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 March 2001.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) *
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948).
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 20010412, 20030131.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 8 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 8 recites the limitations "said corresponding authenticated different user identifier" in lines 21-22 and "said mapped user identifier" in lines 22-23. There is insufficient antecedent basis for these limitations in the claims. For purposes of interpreting the prior art, it is assumed that these refer to the "authenticated different user identifier of a first application" recited in line 8 of Claim 6.

Claim 17 recites the limitations "said corresponding authenticated different user identifier" in lines 5-6 and "said mapped user identifier" in lines 6-7. There is insufficient antecedent basis for these limitations in the claims. For purposes of interpreting the prior art, it is assumed that these refer to the "authenticated different user identifier of said parent application" recited in line 21 in Claim 14.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1, 3-8, and 10-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Cohen et al, US Patent 6178511.

In reference to Claim 1, Cohen discloses an authentication system including an authentication processor (Figure 2, Authentication Module 21) that receives user identification information and initiates authentication of the user identification information using an authentication service (column 6, lines 8-18) and a communication processor that communicates an authentication service identifier and a corresponding user identifier to a managing application (column 6, lines 26-37).

In reference to Claim 3, Cohen further discloses that the user identification information includes a password (column 4, line 64-column 5, line 2).

In reference to Claims 4 and 5, Cohen further discloses compiling a database accessible to other applications for mapping a user identifier of one application to an already authenticated user identifier of another application (column 4, line 61-column 5, line 6, and column 5, lines 16-22).

In reference to Claim 6, Cohen discloses an authentication system including an authentication processor that receives and compiles into a database pairs of authentication service identifiers and user identifiers (column 4, line 61-column 5, line 6) and maps a user identifier of a second application to an already authenticated user identifier of a first application (column 6, lines 26-37). Cohen further discloses a communication processor that sends the authenticated user identifier to the second application (column 6, lines 38-45).

In reference to Claim 7, Cohen further discloses identifying an authentication service that provides an authenticated user identifier (column 4, lines 48-50).

In reference to Claim 8, Cohen further discloses matching the authentication service identifier of the second application with the authentication service identifier of the first application (column 6, lines 26-37).

In reference to Claim 10, Cohen further discloses that the authenticated user identifier of the first application is used by the second application (column 6, lines 38-45), thus eliminating the need for the second application to authenticate the user (column 2, lines 28-31).

In reference to Claim 11, Cohen further discloses sending a parameter identifying success or failure of the mapping (column 10, lines 35-37).

In reference to Claim 12, Cohen further discloses that the authentication processor receives an authentication service identifier and user identifier from the first application (column 6, lines 13-29).

In reference to Claim 13, Cohen further discloses that the authentication service identifier employs a predetermined data format (column 5, lines 30-44, and column 5, line 63-column 6, line 7).

In reference to Claim 14, Cohen discloses an authentication system including an authentication processor that receives an authentication service identifier and a user identifier from a parent application (column 4, line 61-column 5, line 6) and maps a user identifier of a child application to an already authenticated user identifier of the parent application (column 6, lines 26-37). Cohen further discloses a communication processor that communicates the authenticated user identifier to the child application (column 6, lines 38-45).

In reference to Claim 15, Cohen further discloses that the parent application begins a session and the child application uses the authentication system to join the session (column 6, lines 38-45).

In reference to Claim 16, Cohen further discloses that the authentication processor compiles a database using pairs of authentication service identifiers and corresponding user identifiers (column 4, line 61-column 5, line 6) and uses the database in mapping the user identifier of the child application to the already authenticated user identifier of the parent application (column 6, lines 26-37).

In reference to Claim 17, Cohen further discloses matching the authentication service identifier of the child application with the authentication service identifier of the parent application (column 6, lines 26-37).

In reference to Claim 18, Cohen further discloses identifying an authentication service that provides an authenticated user identifier (column 4, lines 48-50).

In reference to Claim 19, Cohen further discloses that the authenticated user identifier of the parent application is used by the child application (column 6, lines 38-45), thus eliminating the need for the child application to authenticate the user (column 2, lines 28-31).

In reference to Claim 20, Cohen further discloses that the child application enables access in response to receiving the authenticated user identifier without the user re-entering the user identification information (column 2, lines 28-31, and column 6, lines 38-45).

Claims 21 and 22 are method claims that correspond substantially to the systems of claims 14 and 16 respectively, and are rejected by a similar rationale.

Claim 23 is a method claim that corresponds substantially to the system of claim 1, and is accordingly rejected by a similar rationale.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 2 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cohen in view of Dustan et al, US Patent 5884312.

In reference to Claims 2 and 9, Cohen discloses everything as applied to Claims 1 and 6 above. However, Cohen does not explicitly disclose a session identifier identifying a user-initiated session of operation. Dustan discloses a system in which a session ID is sent with user identification to authenticate to a network resource (column 13, line 65-column 14, line 2). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of Cohen by including the use of a session identifier, in order to increase security by preventing a different user from viewing confidential files (see Dustan, column 14, lines 2-5).

Conclusion

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- a. Perlman, US Patent 5892828, discloses a method of verifying a user's password to multiple applications.
- b. White, US Patent 6049877, discloses a system for authenticating a user to various applications by issuing and validating an authentication token.
- c. Leong et al, US Patent 6557039, disclose a system that allows a user to access multiple applications using one sign-on and password.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Zachary A Davis whose telephone number is (571) 272-3870. The examiner can normally be reached on weekdays 8:30-6:00, alternate Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Caldwell can be reached on (571) 272-3868. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

ZAD
zad

Matthew Smithers
MATTHEW SMITHERS
PRIMARY EXAMINER
Art Unit 2137